

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 867

EC 005 290

AUTHOR Cole, Charles W.; And Others
TITLE Survey of Attitudes of Parents and Teachers to Services Provided by the Educational Diagnostic and Planning Center.
INSTITUTION Educational Diagnostic and Planning Center, Cheyenne, Wyo.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO TR-4
BUREAU NO BR-672789
PUB DATE Sep 68
GRANT OEG-4-7-672789-3038
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.25
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes, Behavior Problems, Educational Diagnosis, Educational Planning, Evaluation Methods, *Exceptional Child Services, *Parent Attitudes, Program Effectiveness, *Program Evaluation, Program Planning, Psychoeducational Clinics, Surveys, *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Educational Diagnostic and Planning Center

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of the Educational Diagnostic and Planning Center of Cheyenne is presented. Data and summaries report administrator, teacher, and parent opinion and reaction for spring of 1967, summer 1967, and spring 1968. In general, the responses were reported as favorable, but the needs of decreasing the time lag between referral, treatment, and response, avoiding the attempt to provide too varied services, and increasing communication lines to the teaching and administrative faculty were noted. Ten extensive tables present the specific results of the evaluation. (JM)

ED037867

Educational Diagnostic and Planning Center
School Administration Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

Project Number: 672789
Grant Number: OEG-4-7-672789-3038

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 4

**SURVEY OF ATTITUDES OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS
TO SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE EDUCATIONAL
DIAGNOSTIC AND PLANNING CENTER**

BY

Charles W. Cole, Ph.D., Eugene R. Oetting, Ph.D.,
C. Dean Miller, Ed.D., and Theodore L. B. Gloeckler

"This work presented was performed pursuant to
a grant from the U. S. Office of Education,
Department of Health, Education and Welfare."

September, 1968

ED005290E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

ED037867

**SURVEY OF ATTITUDES OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS
TO SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE EDUCATIONAL
DIAGNOSTIC AND PLANNING CENTER**

The following report presents data and summaries of one phase of the evaluation of the Educational Diagnostic and Planning Center for the two year period from September, 1967, through May, 1968. The work was conducted under the supervision of the Rocky Mountain Behavioral Science Institute, Incorporated, who also prepared the summaries included in the report.

Spring - 1967

In May, 1967, at the end of the first year of operation of the Center a survey was made among the teachers of all those children with whom the Center staff worked actively and among the principals of the schools from which they were referred. In this first survey, responses were received from every school in District #1 and from three parochial schools. Of the sixty-six forms sent, fifty-one (77.2%) were returned. Since no space was given on the form for identifying data, most were returned anonymously.

Although space was given for comments, twelve of the questions were answered in a quantifiable manner. For the first eight questions the teachers were asked to indicate their opinions by circling a number following each of the presented statements. These numbers indicate:

- 1 - waste of time
- 2 - of little value
- 3 - no opinion or does not apply
- 4 - somewhat helpful
- 5 - very helpful

The eight statements to which these responses were made were:*

- 1. Distribution of new materials.
- 2. Dissemination of new ideas and methods to assist teachers in working with individual children with learning problems.
- 3. Assistance in helping teachers better understand the needs of individual children with learning problems.
- 4. Personal contacts with the Center staff.
- 5. Assistance provided to help teachers work with all the children in the classroom.
- 6. Information received from the Center regarding children who have been referred.

*A copy of the form has not been included here since they were mimeographed on legal size paper.

7. Individual educational programs developed for pupils seen at the Center.
8. Teachers' involvement in staffing and the development of individual programs for children seen at the Center.

For questions number nine, ten, eleven, and twelve, answers of "Yes" or "No" were appropriate although in the 1967 form not all these questions had blanks indicating those possibilities. These questions were:

9. Have you been asked to do too much work as a result of having referred children to the Center? ____Yes ____No
10. Has the child's behavior changed? ____Yes ____No
11. Have there been any changes in the child's relationship with other children? ____Yes ____No
12. Has referring children to the Center been worth the effort involved? ____Yes ____No

The data received from these forms appear on Table #1 and Table #2 and are followed by a summary report from the Rocky Mountain Behavioral Science Institute, Incorporated. No effort was made to record and tabulate the number of blanks on each item and therefore the totals and percentages reflect this deficit.

TABLE # 1

Teacher - Administrator Responses - 1967

	Number of Responses	Waste of Time	Percent in Each Category			
			Of Little Value	No Opinion	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
Distribution of new materials	37	5.4	18.9	51.3	13.5	10.8
Dissemination of new ideas and methods to assist teachers in working with individual children with learning problems	36	5.5	22.2	22.2	36.1	13.8
Assistance in helping teachers better understand the needs of individual children with learning problems	39	2.5	30.7	25.6	30.7	10.2
Personal contacts with KDPC staff	40	---	22.5	5.0	55.0	17.5
Assistance provided to help teachers work with all of the children in a classroom	37	5.4	37.8	40.5	10.8	5.4
Information received from the Center regarding children who had been referred	41	7.3	41.4	9.7	35.1	9.7
Individual educational programs developed for pupils seen at the Center	40	15.0	25.0	32.5	12.5	15.5
Teachers involvement in the staffing and development of individual programs for children seen at the Center	38	7.8	28.9	26.3	26.3	10.5
Totals in Number	19		88	81	84	52
Total in Percent	5.2		24.4	22.5	23.3	14.4

TABLE # 2

Teacher - Administrator Responses - 1967

	YES	%	NO	%	UNDECIDED	%
Have you been asked to do too much work as a result of your having referred children to the Center?	4	7.8%	38	74.5%	0	0
Has the child's behavior changed?	18	35.2%	23	45.0%	0	0
Have there been changes in the child's relationship to other pupils?	14	27.4%	25	49.0%	2	3.9%
Has referring children to the Center been worth the effort?	24	47.0%	11	21.5%	7	13.7%

Summary 1967 Data

In the spring (May, 1967) after the first year of operation of the Educational Diagnostic and Planning Center, survey forms were sent to all teachers who had referred children to the Center and to principals and administrators in the system. Fifty-one forms were returned to the Center.

The results of the evaluation forms indicate that many teachers expected much more from the Educational Diagnostic and Planning Center than was accomplished. Although they were of the general opinion that the Center was sincerely concerned with helping the referred children, many of the teachers felt that the Center was not handling enough referrals.

Some of the complaints written on the evaluation sheets were:

1. There should be a better screening process. There should be more time spent on the more serious cases, rather than on less urgent referrals.
2. The service was too slow. Many teachers were not seeing any progress being made in helping the child who was referred.
3. Many teachers complained that the Center was not communicating enough with them. The teachers wanted to know more about what the Center was doing with their referrals and what progress was being made.
4. The most common complaint was that the Center couldn't handle enough referrals. But here there was a difference of opinion among the teachers. While many thought the Center should take as many referrals as possible, others thought that the Center's staff shouldn't spread themselves too thinly. As indicated under complaint Number 1 (above), several teachers thought the Center should spend more time with those needing the service the most.

The suggestions made by the teachers for next year's operations followed closely to their complaints. These suggestions generally centered around accepting more referrals and better screening methods. The most common and obvious solution would be to expand the Center and its staff to handle more referrals. Rather than expand the Center's staff, it was suggested that the Center give in-service training to regular classroom teachers, or have regular teachers, employed by the District, make visits to the Center to observe the staffs' methods.

If the Center couldn't be expanded, it was suggested that each school be allowed a certain quota of referrals, and that this quota favor younger children rather than older ones.

Some teachers advocated more half-way classes, although one teacher thought the pupils didn't care for them, thinking it a waste of time. This teacher suggested getting children more accustomed to hard work.

The results of the individual evaluation questions ran like this:

1. Was too much work required of you? Most teachers answered, "no". Many teachers wanted to put in more time with the problem of referred children. This is evident from the many complaints for more communication from the Center.
2. Has the child's behavior changed? There was an almost even number of yes and no answers. Some teachers said not yet.
3. Has there been any change in the child's peer relationship? Most answered no.
4. Has referring children to the Center been worth the effort involved? Most answered yes. There seems to be a strong relation between seeing a change for the better or expecting one and answering yes and seeing no change or a change for the worse and answering no. Many said it was too soon to tell.

The results on the teachers' attitudes in regards to certain items ran like this:

1. Distribution of new materials. Teacher's responses were about evenly distributed between being helpful and not being helpful.
2. Dissemination of new methods. More teachers thought it helpful than not helpful.
3. Assistance in helping teachers' understanding of children's problems. Slightly more of the teachers thought it helpful than not helpful.
4. Personal contact with Educational Diagnostic and Planning Center staff. Most of the teachers thought this somewhat helpful.
5. Assistance in working with all children. Most thought this was of little value.
6. Information received from the Center on referred children. Teacher's responses were about evenly distributed between being helpful and not being helpful.
7. Individual educational programs developed for pupils seen at the Center. More of the teachers thought this of little value or a waste of time than helpful.
8. Teachers' involvement in staffing and development of individual programs for children seen at Center. Teachers' responses were evenly distributed between being helpful and not being helpful.

With all the complaints and suggestions made by the teachers, there was also much praise for the Center. The Center's staff was considered as a qualified, hard-working and sincere group. Teachers commented favorably on the new methods and the variety of work materials of the Center. They indicated that the staff has been helpful to the children and their parents, by helping parents understand some of the difficulties, and help to the teachers by taking some of the pressure off them. The Center was commended on their promptness, their initial contacts and testing and their consultant service.

Some teachers indicated that they were kept well informed by the Center. Some liked the methods used for reading problems, speaking and social play.

Many teachers realized that the work has just begun and that they should not expect too much after such a short time. However, many also realized the great potential of the Educational Diagnostic and Planning Center.

Spring - 1968

At the end of the first one half year of operation, the teachers, principals, and administrators who had referred children to EDPC were surveyed to find out what their general opinion of EDPC was and to obtain recommendations for changes in the program. While the general attitude was favorable, the teachers made many specific suggestions and recommendations which were used to modify and improve EDPC programming. This year (1967-1968) completed the second year of EDPC operations and the first complete academic year. The teachers were again surveyed, and, in addition, the parents of the children involved in EDPC programs were surveyed. A very high percentage of teachers and parents felt that EDPC was highly valuable and that it was meeting its goals. Again, some suggestions were made that might lead to improvement in the Center's operations and relationships with parents and teachers.

Attitudes of Parents to EDPC

Table #3 on the next page summarizes the parent's response to that part of the survey that asked for ratings of attitudes. The first item is most important, indicating whether parents felt that the individual program developed for their child was helpful. Over 90% rated the program as either helpful or very helpful.

Some of the comments made by parents illustrate the personal price that must be paid when a child is unable to deal with the educational environment and what a service such as EDPC means to the parents of such a child.

"Our child has been able to attend public school as a result of the Center's working with her."

"He no longer feels worthless and 'dumb'. Best of all, he no longer suffers from nightmares. He still has a long way to go, but he is no longer lost."

"Only my heartfelt thanks!"

In a major program it is probably impossible to satisfy everyone, even though this program came very close to doing exactly that. Only two parents gave the program negative ratings. The response of one parent who felt the program was of little value is informative. He stated:

My son feels we in the home have been the trouble. I think he has been brainwashed and given the wrong ideas of us as parents. We're not drunks, we are clean citizens. We did have respect in the community. What next!

TABLE # 3

Attitudes of Parents Toward EDC

	Total Number	Percent of Parents Responding to Question				No Opinion or does Not Apply Number
		Waste of Time	Of Little Value	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful	Number Responding
Individual program designed for your child.	30	3.45	3.45	27.59	65.52	29
Personal contacts with the Center staff.	32	-----	3.45	17.24	79.31	29
Information received from the Center in regard to your child and his problems.	31	-----	14.29	7.14	78.57	28
Information received from the school about the operation.	30	4.76	9.52	33.33	52.38	21
Information received about the operation from Center staff.	28	-----	-----	13.04	86.97	23
Information received about the operation from publicity.	27	-----	33.33	22.22	44.44	18

The one parent who indicated that the program was a waste of time did state that the staff member was helpful, but felt that the Center had actually prevented their son from receiving help. In this case, the severity of the boy's disturbance had led the staff member to recommend referral to the local mental health center. Instead the parents had gone to a volunteer organization of undergraduate college students. A young man from that organization had come to EDPC to find out more about the problem, and had been informed that the Center viewed the problem as severe. He apparently decided not to follow through with the case.

One of the problems that a program like EDPC runs into is the unwillingness of parents to admit that their children are emotionally disturbed. Parents frequently become defensive or fearful and reject this kind of interpretation. The EDPC program apparently has done very well in handling these feelings for most parents, even though they have not been able to deal with them in every case.

The four questions on the survey dealing with information provided by the highly favorable attitude toward the Center. The information provided by the Center staff was seen by every parent who checked the ratings as either somewhat helpful or very helpful. On the question about information received impersonally from the Center, the rating was slightly less positive, but over three-fourths of the parents still rated the information as very helpful. Attitudes toward information obtained from the school are somewhat less favorable, as are those toward publicity.

Two questions were asked relating to the parents' efforts in the program (see Table #4). No parent indicated that he had been asked to do too much work, and thirty-three of the thirty-six respondents said the program had been worth the effort.

One of the parents who indicated that it was not worth the effort, also indicated that his child had improved in social behavior, deportment, and attitude, and that personal contacts with the Center staff had been helpful, suggesting that there was an error in marking the response.

In evaluating the attitudes of parents, TABLE II shows one of the most important aspects of the EDPC program. The parents were asked what changes had occurred in their child. Most of the parents saw improvements in academic work, in social behavior, in deportment and in attitude. All but three parents checked at least one item as improved. Of these three, one parent saw his child as getting worse in academic work and deportment and another saw his child as getting worse in social behavior and attitude. The third indicated no change in any category.

It is clear that, in the view of the great majority of the parents, their children were changing for the better as a result of the EDPC program. Even some of the parents who marked "no change" in one or more areas were clearly favorable toward the program, but simply wanted more from it. One mother complained that ground that had gained was lost because the program did not continue through the summer, another stated that her daughter had not had enough work as yet to make a change.

Table #4

PARENTS EVALUATION OF EDPC SERVICES

	N	% of Each	
		Yes	No
Have you been asked to do too much work as a result of your child's having been referred to the Center?	33	---	100.00
Has referring your child to the Center been worth the effort involved?	33	90.90	9.09

	N	% of Each		
		Improvement	No Change	Worse
What kinds of changes have you seen in your child's performance in the following areas?				
Academic	31	74.19	22.58	3.22
Social behavior	30	83.33	13.33	3.33
Deportment	29	62.07	34.48	3.45
Attitude	30	76.67	20.00	3.33

The results of the survey show very clearly that the parents of the children involved support the EDCP program. The staff of the Center have created the strongest favorable impression--even some of the parents who were critical of other aspects of the program felt the staff were helpful. The parents generally feel that the program was useful and worthwhile and that their children changed positively. While the staff of the Center could hardly improve their relations with the parents, the survey does suggest that the Center's publicity might be reviewed and increased. There is also an indication that the parents might be asked to participate more in the program since no parent suggested that he had been asked to do too much work.

Attitudes of Teachers and Administrators

The responses of the teacher-administrator populations have been presented in Tables #5, #6, and #7 on the following pages. It is worth noting that, among the 56 persons who responded to the survey, the vast majority see the services to children referred to the Center as highly worthwhile (86.54%). Many feel that the Center's programs have increased their insight into the behavior problems of children (75.51%) and that--perhaps most important--the behavior of the children has changed since they were referred to the Center. The greatest benefits to the children appear to be in attitudinal changes and in improved classroom performance; however, in over half of the cases, improved peer relationships were also noted.

A content analysis of teacher's and administrator's written comments revealed one outstanding (and highly relevant) area in which the Center had met its goals. Fifteen of the respondents wrote comments indicating that they had observed significant behavioral and/or academic improvement in children who had been referred. In general, the comments suggest that the reaction to the work of the Center has been positive. In several cases, staff of the Center were commended for their work in staffing cases with teachers, their work with parents, and for their effectiveness in planning individual programs for referred children. Some commented that the Center had provided valuable resource materials, and in several cases, the Center was commended for staying with referred children for the extended period of time required for real improvement.

Many of the criticisms were also based on highly favorable attitudes toward EDCP and its programs. The teachers and administrators only wanted more and faster service. A frequent comment was that the Center reached too few children. Along with this was the opinion that in some cases, the time from referral to treatment was too long. These appeared to be primary factors in suggestions which indicated a sentiment for expanding the staff and facilities of the Center. A few of the respondents criticized the Center for inadequate staffing and other contacts with school personnel. In general, it was felt that there should be increased individual contact with teachers and administrators focused both on the problems of individual students as well as more general types of contact aimed at making teachers more aware of the resources available to them through the Center.

TABLE #5

Teacher - Administrator Response: - 1968

	Number of Responses	Waste of Time	Percent in Each Category			
			Of Little Value	No Opinion	Somewhat Helpful	Very Helpful
Distribution of new materials	53	---	3.77	41.51	28.30	26.42
Dissemination of new ideas and methods to assist teachers in working with individual children with learning problems	50	---	8.00	40.00	32.00	20.00
Assistance in helping teachers better understand the needs of individual children with learning problems	49	---	6.12	20.41	40.82	32.65
Personal contacts with EDPG staff	53	---	3.77	16.98	33.96	45.28
Assistance provided to help teachers work with all of the children in a classroom	50	---	12.00	50.00	24.00	14.00
Information received from the Center regarding children who had been referred	50	2.00	4.00	8.00	48.00	38.00
Individual educational programs developed for pupils seen at the Center	45	---	6.67	26.67	31.11	35.56
Teachers involvement in the staffing and development of individual programs for children seen at the Center	50	---	4.00	32.00	26.00	38.00

Table # 6

Teacher-Administrator Responses

To Service Evaluation Survey

	Number of Responses	% Each Category Yes	No
Have you been asked to do too much work as a result of your having referred children to the Center?	43	2.33	97.67
Has the child's behavior changed?	53	60.38	39.62
Have there been changes in the child's relationship to other pupils?	54	74.07	25.93
Has referring children to the Center been worth the effort?	52	86.54	13.46
Has your work with the Center helped you broaden your perceptions of the varieties and/or causes of children's problems?	49	75.51	24.49

TABLE #7

Behavioral Changes Noted by Teachers

What kinds of changes have you seen in pupils' performance in the following areas?	Number of Responses	% Of Each Category		
		Improvement	No Change	Worse
Academic work	50	76.00	24.00	---
Social behavior	45	66.67	3.33	---
Deportment	46	56.52	41.30	2.17
Attitude	43	74.42	25.58	---

Some suggestions and criticisms appear to indicate specific breakdowns in the Center's communication system in regard to individual teachers. Nine persons suggested that communications should be improved. While there were only a few serious breakdowns in communication, these should be noted. One teacher stated that promised materials had not been delivered. Three respondents indicated that the information they had received was inadequate. One respondent stated that the Center had failed to develop individualized programs for students. Comments such as these highlight the importance of following through on Center commitments.

By and large, the respondents indicated that the services of the Center should be continued or expanded. There were some indications that the Center is seen as spreading itself too thin and one person suggested that, given present limitations, the Center should do more intensive work with even fewer children. Perhaps the Center is not realistic enough in regard to its staff and time limitations.

It was frequently mentioned that the individualization of help, the designing of individual programs and personal contact with students, was the major ingredient in promoting better school adjustment. Since the inception of the Center, it appears that school personnel have become increasingly aware of the significant number of children who are in need of help; however, some appear to have found this awareness somewhat irritating. One respondent commented, "I think its a waste of time and money which could be better used elsewhere!" Another respondent a different attitude. After generally positive comment on the services provided by the Center, he added that, in his opinion, lack of support within the school system and at the level of the general public would result in the termination of the EDPC program when federal funding is withdrawn. Of course, this may or may not be true, but this type of prediction would probably not have been made unless there was some deficit in the Center's public relations-communications activities.

A Comparison of Teachers' and Parents' Ratings

On the forms sent in May, 1968 to both teachers and parents the following question was added:

14. What kinds of changes have you seen in pupils' (your child's) performance in the following areas?

	Improvement	No Change	Worse
Academic work	_____	_____	_____
Social Behavior	_____	_____	_____
Deportment	_____	_____	_____
Attitude	_____	_____	_____

Because objectivity was desired, both teachers and parents had the option of returning the forms unidentified. During the first years' evaluations among teachers, only three were turned in with identifying

data. Despite these high percentages, it was possible to match teacher and parent responses for only thirteen children.

Forty-six of fifty-two responses were checked by both parent and teacher. There was an 82.6 percent agreement on the checked items and in no case did the two check opposite ends of the short continuum.

These results indicate that, for this sample at least, the parents and teachers are seeing the same kinds of changes (or the absence of changes) in the children referred.

Reactions to Center Materials

The teachers who received materials from EDPC were also asked about their attitudes toward these materials. From the response in Table VI, it is clear that this was one of the most successful aspects of the EDPC program. Every teacher responding said that the Center either provided materials that the teacher previously knew about or introduced the teacher to new materials, and most teachers checked both of these items "yes." Every teacher felt that the materials they received were of sufficient value to warrant purchase by the district.

The attitude toward the Center staff was once again highly favorable, with all of the teachers checking that they had received assistance from staff or that they had not needed assistance. Several of the teachers commented about the value of the materials and the service that was provided, with a number of particular comments about the help of individual staff members. One of the teachers also suggested that a list of materials be compiled and distributed to teachers.

The potential value of this service is shown even more clearly by the example of one particular teacher. After being introduced to new materials, she went to considerable trouble to obtain further materials on phonics and plans to use them on a continuing basis. Unlike many services, that provide only direct help, this kind of assistance creates a potential in the teacher for continuing on her own without Center assistance. It should also be noted that teachers provided with materials for one student very frequently used them for other students or even for the whole class. The uniformly favorable response suggests that this program should be expanded as much as possible.

Comparisons With Previous Data

Table #9 shows the comparison between the 1967 and 1968 data for the first eight items on the teacher-administrator form and Table # 10 presents a similar comparison for items #9, 10, 11, and 12. Responses to this survey reveal both change and constancy when they are compared to the results of the identical survey made at the end of the first half year of Center operation. In May of 1967, it was commented that the Center should do a better job of screening in order to separate cases requiring immediate attention from others less urgent. In the present survey, while screening

TABLE #8

Materials Survey

	<u>N</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Was the Center instrumental in providing materials which you knew about but which were not otherwise available to you?	17	16	1
Was the Center instrumental in introducing you to new materials of which you were not earlier aware?	16	15	1
Were these materials of sufficient value that you would hope the school district could provide them permanently in your school for your use?	16	16	--
Did you receive assistance from a Center staff member on the use of these materials?	18	<u>Yes</u> 14	<u>No</u> --
		<u>Not Needed</u> 4	
	<u>N</u>	<u>One pupil only</u>	<u>All pupils in class</u>
These materials were used by (or with):*	21	9	6

*A number of teachers checked more than one category.

TABLE #9

COMPARISON OF REPLIES: 1967 - 1968

<u>Item</u>	<u>Waste of Time</u>	<u>Of Little Value</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>	<u>Somewhat Helpful</u>	<u>Very Helpful</u>
1. Distribution of new materials	2 - 0	7 - 2	19 - 22	5 - 15	4 - 13
2. Dissemination of new ideas and methods to assist teachers in working with individual children with learning problems.	2 - 0	8 - 4	8 - 20	13 - 16	5 - 10
3. Assisting in helping teachers better understand the needs of individual children with learning problems.	1 - 0	12 - 3	10 - 10	12 - 20	4 - 16
4. Personal contacts with EDPC staff.	0 - 0	9 - 2	2 - 9	22 - 18	7 - 24
5. Assistance provided to help teachers work with all of the children in a classroom.	2 - 0	14 - 6	15 - 25	4 - 12	2 - 7
6. Information received from the Center regarding children who had been referred.	3 - 1	17 - 2	4 - 4	13 - 24	4 - 19
7. Individual educational programs developed for pupils seen at the Center.	6 - 0	10 - 3	13 - 12	5 - 14	6 - 16
8. Teachers involvement in the staffing and development of individual programs for children seen at the Center	3 - 0	11 - 2	10 - 16	10 - 13	4 - 19
N - 1967: 51	19 - 1	88 - 24	81 - 118	84 - 132	52 - 124
N - 1968: 56	5.2	24.4	22.5	23.3	14.4
PERCENTAGE '67	--	5.3	26.3	29.4	27.6
'68					

TABLE # 10

Comparison of 1967 and 1968 Data

	<u>1967</u>		<u>1968</u>	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Have you been asked to do too much work as a result of your having referred children to the Center?	4	7.8%	38	74.5%
			1	2.33%
			42	97.67%
Has the child's behavior changed?	18	35.2%	32	60.30%
			21	39.62%
Have there been changes in the child's relationship to other pupils?	14	27.4%	40	74.07%
			14	25.93%
Has referring children to the Center been worth the effort?	24	47.6%	45	86.54%
			7	13.46%

per se was not mentioned, several respondents commented on the thoroughness and appropriateness of the diagnostic work done by the Center, suggesting that this problem has been taken care of.

It is apparent that there is still concern with the limited number of referrals that the Center is able to process; the time between referral and staff action is still a matter of some concern; however, from current responses, these are not major items. The most prominent feature of the current survey is the continuing dissatisfaction with the amount of communication between Center staff and teaching personnel. This was seen as a problem at the end of the first year also. (It should be noted, however, that where staff conferences, etc., were held, the response was quite positive.)

Again, as in the previous year, the vast majority of teachers stated that working with the Center required very little of their time. (Over 97% said that referrals had not created "too much" work.) The majority of teachers still claim that referral to the Center is worth the effort. This is probably related to the fact that they have seen positive changes in many of the children treated by the Center. This is one of the more striking differences between the results of the current survey and the previous one: the majority of teachers noted changes in academic and social behaviors, in attitudes, and in peer relationships. In the first survey, about half of the respondents said that they had observed behavior changes in referrals. In this survey, over 60% said that the behavior of referred children had changed. In the first survey, most of the teachers indicated that there had been no change in the child's peer relationships. In this survey, over 74% indicated that peer relationships had improved.

A final point of comparison which appears to reflect an attitudinal shift on the part of the teachers involved in Center programs. Where formerly they seemed to have, for the most part, considered individual educational programs as a waste of time, individualization in all its forms, from counseling through special remedial programs, is now seen as a key factor in many cases where the Center's intervention has been successful.

Summary and Conclusions

It is apparent that response to the services provided by the Center has become increasingly positive during its second year of operations. Major complaints center around the inability of the Center, given its limitations of staff and funding, to provide services to the extent desired. Increased personal contact with teaching and administrative faculty seems to deserve a high priority in future Center activities. It would seem advisable for the Center to avoid promising more than it can deliver, to do what it does do very well, and to decrease the time lag between referral, treatment, and initial feedback to school personnel. There is obviously a greater demand for services than the Center can meet. Effective action may well be instrumental in demonstrating to the general professional and lay public the necessity for broad-based local support of many of the diagnostic and remedial programs currently sponsored exclusively by the Center. The essential groundwork has been laid, for the current survey

documents the fact that (1) teachers are more aware of the problems of children, (2) they are more aware of available resources and materials which can be brought to bear within the context of the school, and (3) the behavior of many children changes in positive directions as an apparent consequence of individual intervention. In spite of problems, in spite of a continuing tendency to spread itself too thin, in spite of communication difficulties with individuals, it is evident that the Center and its staff have initiated many significant changes in the educational structure of the Cheyenne community.